UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of North Carolina

v.		
)	
RICHARD OLTON	Case No:	DNCW303CR000127-001
) USM No:	17892-058
Date of Original Judgment: June 7, 2005 Date of Last Amended Judgment:	${}$ Pro se	
Date of East Amended Judgment.	Defendant's A	ttorney
		•
Order Regarding Motion for Sentence Re	duction Pursu	ant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)
Upon motion of ■ the defendant □ the Director § 3582(c)(2) for a reduction in the term of imprisonment impossible subsequently been lowered and made retroactive by the Unit § 994(u), and having considered such motion, and taking intend the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), t	posed based on ted States Sente o account the p	a guideline sentencing range that has encing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. solicy statement set forth at USSG §1B1.10
IT IS ORDERED that the motion is: ■ DENIED. □ GRANTED and the defendant's the last judgment issued) of		osed sentence of imprisonment (as reflected in ed to
COURT DETERMINATION OF CHIRELINE DANG	CIE (D:	
I. COURT DETERMINATION OF GUIDELINE RANGE Original Offense Level: 34	•	ffense Level: 32
Criminal History Category: I		story Category: I
Original Guideline Range: 240 months		uideline Range: 240 months
The previous term of imprisonment imposed was less that	•	range applicable to the defendant at the time
of sentencing and the reduced sentence is comparably les The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline ran	s than the amen	
of sentencing and the reduced sentence is comparably les The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline ran Other (explain): Due to the statutory mandatory minimum	s than the amerage. m sentence req	uired in this case, there is no change in the
of sentencing and the reduced sentence is comparably les The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline ran Other (explain): Due to the statutory mandatory minimum guideline calculations. HII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS Defendant also sentenced to 120 months concurrent on	s than the amerage. m sentence req Count Three	uired in this case, there is no change in the
of sentencing and the reduced sentence is comparably les The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline ran Other (explain): Due to the statutory mandatory minimum guideline calculations. HII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS Defendant also sentenced to 120 months concurrent on Four. Except as provided above, all provisions of the judgment data.	s than the amerage. m sentence req Count Three	uired in this case, there is no change in the
of sentencing and the reduced sentence is comparably les The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline ran Other (explain): Due to the statutory mandatory minimum guideline calculations. HII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS Defendant also sentenced to 120 months concurrent on Four. Except as provided above, all provisions of the judgment data.	s than the amerage. m sentence req Count Three ted June 7, 20	and 60 months consecutive on Count shall remain in effect.
of sentencing and the reduced sentence is comparably les The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline ran Other (explain): Due to the statutory mandatory minimum guideline calculations. HII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS Defendant also sentenced to 120 months concurrent on Four.	s than the amerage. m sentence req Count Three ted June 7, 20	uired in this case, there is no change in the